

**Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
San Diego County Office of Education
Professional Services Division**

May 13, 2009

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at the San Diego County Office of Education. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

Common Standards (2008)

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	X		
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation		X	
Standard 3: Resources	X		
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel		X	
Standard 5: Admission	X		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	X		
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	n/a		
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors	n/a		
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	19	16	3	0
Designated Subjects: Vocational/Career Technical Education	19	16	3	0
Professional Administrative Services - Guidelines Based	7	7	0	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Committee on Accreditation Accreditation Team Report

Institution: San Diego County Office of Education
Dates of Visit: March 29, 2009 – April 1, 2009
Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation for San Diego County Office of Education was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards—

The total team reviewed each element of the nine Common Standards and decided as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. Five Common Standards are 'Met;' two Common Standards are 'Met with Concerns;' and two Common Standards are not applicable to this institution.

Program Standards –

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the total team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met. In the Administrative Services: Clear Program, all program standards are Met. In the Designated Subjects: Adult Education Credential Program, all standards are 'Met' except for 3 standards which are 'Met with Concerns.' In the Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education/Vocational Education Teaching Credential Program, all program standards are 'Met' except for 3 which are 'Met with Concerns'.

2. Overall Recommendation –

Due to the fact that only two Common Standards are met with Concerns and three program standards are met with concerns in each of the Designated Subjects programs, the team reached consensus on the recommendation of **ACCREDITATION WITH STIPULATIONS**.

Accreditation Recommendations

The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for San Diego County Office of Education and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH STIPULATIONS**.

- (1) That the institution submit evidence that a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that addresses all approved credential programs has been developed and is guiding program modification consistent with board-adopted mission and goals.
- (2) That the institution submit evidence that a system to evaluate faculty and instructors is in place and that the results are utilized by decision makers within the unit.
- (3) That the institution submit a program proposal addressing the CTE Program Standards.
- (4) That the institution submit evidence that it has addressed the three standards that are less than fully met for the Adult Education Teacher Preparation Program.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services: Clear Administrative Services Credential
- Designated Subjects: Adult Education Credential
- Designated Subjects: Vocational (Career Technical) Education Teaching Credential

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- San Diego County Office of Education be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- San Diego County Office of Education be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2015-2016 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

David Simmons
Ventura County Office of Education

Common Standards Cluster:

Edith Thiessen
Fresno Pacific University

Programs Cluster:

Nancy Parachini
University of California, Los Angeles

Rebecca Seher
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Bettie Spatafora
RIMS BTSA

Staff to the Accreditation Team

Catherine Creeggan, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Professional Development Log	Candidate Portfolios
Institutional Self Study	Candidate Work Samples
Course Syllabi	Program Budgets
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbook	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	Faculty Handbook
Information Booklet	Biennial Report
Program Evaluation Data	Field Experience Notebook
Coaching Logs	Website
Candidate Handbook	

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Cluster	Totals
Program Faculty	1	11	12
Institutional Administration	13	11	24
Candidates	38	38	76
Graduates	4	14	18
Employers of Graduates	7	19	26
Advisors	3	1	4
School Administrators	5	17	22
Credential Analyst	10	4	14
Advisory Committee	4	16	20
Total	85	131	216

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

The San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) is one of the 58 County Offices of Education that form the intermediate level of the public education system. As such, SDCOE provides a support infrastructure for its 42 school districts, 732 schools, and 495,689 students, including 158,062 students receiving direct services. SDCOE fulfills statutory mandates to audit school district budgets, register teacher credentials, complete employee background checks, certify school attendance records, and develop countywide programs to serve special student populations.

The San Diego County Superintendent of Schools, appointed by the San Diego County Board of Education, is the chief administrative officer, employer, and developer of programs and services as authorized by state statute or determined by needs or requests. The County Superintendent of Schools has direct oversight responsibilities for approving and assuring school district budgets, calling school district elections, and assisting with school district emergencies by providing necessary services. Additional services include staff development and technical assistance to ensure compliance with the Education Code and federal law. In 2008, 7,096 teacher assignments in San Diego County districts were monitored for compatibility with credential authorization and for compliance.

Other programs and services are of a training, program/service offering or advisory nature. In 2008, all 42 San Diego County districts and districts from around the state participated in 112,060 hours of standards-based professional development training provided to over 6,133 teachers and administrators in core content areas including training in instructional strategies for English learners. SDCOE's Regional Occupational Program (ROP) is the largest County ROP in California, offering tuition-free career preparation and development courses to over 57,400 students each year.

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that educational endeavors at the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) are based on a board-adopted Mission and corresponding Goals, which were established with full community input after an extensive process of research, data collection, and data analysis. The county board-adopted Mission is to provide the highest quality education for students in County Office operated programs, and to support local school boards in providing the same for their students. The Superintendent's Priorities were established to provide a framework for administration to accomplish the county board-adopted Mission and Goals. The Priorities are accompanied by Key Activities to be performed by County Office of Education staff. Implicit in every Priority and Key Activity is the County Office's core function to improve the academic achievement of all students in San Diego County. Further evidence from employee evaluation documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that the Superintendent's Priorities and Key Activities are responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks and provide direction for programs, courses, candidate performance and experiences, and administrator accountability.

SDCOE is currently undergoing a two-year process to create an institution-wide Strategic Plan. For every strategy in the Strategic Plan, an action team of fifteen or more people has been formed (composed of fifty percent SDCOE employees and fifty percent community members, clients, and other interested stakeholders) to create operational plans to implement that strategy. Steps in developing an Action Plan included: Strategy analysis; Information gathering; Creative problem solving; Action plan writing; and Cost-benefit analysis. This structure forms the basis of the evaluation system for all county office administrators, including those whose responsibilities contain the three credential programs.

Credential Programs

In addition to providing professional development to school personnel and direct services to P-Adult students, SDCOE has established programs leading to Administrative Services and Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials. While all three of SDCOE's credential programs work to foster its mission and goals, the populations that the Administrative Tier II and Designated Subjects programs serve are perceived as unique and have, consequently, been housed under separate divisions of the County Office.

The Administrative Tier II Program is housed within the District and School Improvement Unit of the Learning Resources and Educational Technology (LRET) Division. LRET's other units include: Curriculum and Instruction; District and School Improvement; Educational Technology; English Learner and Support Services. The District and School Improvement Unit's function is

to build instructional leadership to ensure coherent systems for increased student achievement. In addition to providing the Administrative Services Program, the unit provides administrators and teachers multiple venues for collaboration, communication and networking in order to support and sustain leadership development, standards-based instruction and assessment, utilization of categorical resources, and support for high priority districts and schools.

The Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials Programs are housed within the Student Services and Programs Division. This division's other units provide direct services to P-Adult students. These programs include Juvenile Court and Community Schools (JCCS), Safe Schools, Pupil Services, the Regional Occupational Program (ROP), and Special Education.

SDCOE's Designated Subjects Credential ~ LEA is approved to offer two programs: Vocational/Career Technical Education and Adult Education. They are also able to recommend Special Subjects and Supervision and Coordination credentials. They serve over 20 San Diego county school districts with ROP, Adult Education, and ROTC programs. They also provide credentialing services to a number of vocational education teachers employed by Department of Correction institutions in other counties, a few ROTC teachers in other counties, as well as a few teachers not currently employed or employed in other types of agencies.

The Administrative Services Tier II program's 2007-2008 completers and 2008-2009 enrollees are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Administrative Services Tier II Program Enrollees and Completers

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2007-2008)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2008-2009)
Administrative Services Tier II	5	5

Unlike most other credential preparation programs, Designated Subjects Adult Education and Vocational/Career Technical Education candidates are issued preliminary credentials and can begin teaching before they have completed any teaching methods coursework. Candidates have up to two years to complete Level I requirements and an additional three years to complete Level II requirements to qualify for clear credentials. SDCOE credential staff indicated that many who apply for preliminary credentials do not complete the requirements to obtain a clear credential. Table 2 includes clear credentials granted in 2007-08 and preliminary credentials issued in 2007-08 and 2008-2009.

Table 2. Adult and Vocational/Career Technical Education Preliminary and Clear Credentials

Program		Clear Credentials	Preliminary Credentials Issued	
		2007-2008	2007-2008	2008-2009 ¹
Adult Education	Full-time	12	35	26
	Part-time	12	19	8
Vocational Education	Full-time	17	63	0
	Part-time	3	15	0
Career Technical Education ²	Full-time	12	45	52
	Part-time	3	8	12
TOTALS		59	185	98

The visit

The visit to San Diego County Office of Education began on Sunday, March 29, 2009 at 12:00 p.m. when team members first met at the hotel. Following the team meeting, a poster session/reception was held at the hotel. At this time, team members met with County Office administrators and program coordinators and shared information about programs. Interviews and examination of documents occurred on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. Two classrooms were visited on Monday. The team met with County Office administrators and program coordinators on Tuesday morning at 9:15 for the mid-visit report. On Tuesday afternoon and evening the team met to discuss all standards and programs. Consensus was reached on all standard findings with a resulting accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was shared on the campus at 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

¹ Total only includes Preliminary Credentials issued through February 1, 2009.

² The Commission began issuing the Designated Subjects CTE Credentials on October 12, 2007, while ceasing the initial issuance of the Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credentials on November 1, 2007.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Education Leadership

Standard Met

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service and unit accountability. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of program faculty and relevant stakeholders. Unit leadership, with institutional support, creates effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution or program sponsor. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

The County Superintendent has oversight authority over all credential programs. The three credential programs are administered by two of the five separate divisions at the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE). A thorough review of the County School Board's goal-setting process and the Superintendent's strategic planning clearly indicates that a research-based vision is fundamental to all SDCOE operations. Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that the Superintendent's Priorities are established to provide a framework for administration to accomplish board-adopted Mission and Goals in a manner responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. These Goals also provide direction for programs, courses, candidate performance and experiences, and administrator accountability. Further evidence from employee evaluation documents and interviews with institutional leadership indicates that the Superintendent's Priorities form the basis of the evaluation system for all county office administrators, including those whose responsibilities contain the three credential programs. As per documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership, each program's managers are included as fully participating action team members. Program leadership has identified the need to represent the interests of each credential program in the institution's operational plans.

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that programs are designed and organized with involvement of faculty members, most of whom are, in addition to their instructional role in the program, County Office administrators. Moreover, the SDCOE Advisory Committee is involved in programmatic decision making. Members include: District Administrators; District & County Credential Technicians; Partnering Universities; Department of Corrections Educational Staff; Non-Public Programs Educational Staff; Job Corps and Trade Unions; as well as San Diego County Office Staff. This allows frequent communication and collaboration among relevant stakeholders in addressing ongoing programmatic issues, as well as in planning and implementing programmatic changes. The SDCOE Advisory Committee's future plans are to use the site-visit's findings and the COA's determination to reflect on and refine the unit's operations and improve program quality and integrate recommendations into Career Technical Education (CTE) and Adult Education program planning once the new standards are approved.

Evidence from documents and interviews with multiple constituents indicates widespread customer satisfaction and confirms consistently positive outcomes for candidates. However,

organizational structures vary among programs within the unit. Evidence does not seem to indicate that unit leadership has taken full advantage of its authority over all aspects of program implementation.

While there are Memoranda-of-Understanding (MOU) between the institution and the universities providing courses and faculty to the unit, evidence does not indicate that administration has taken full advantage of its authority over all aspects of program implementation. Unit leadership indicates that they intend to update the MOUs. Although the Institution considers partner districts outside the unit, each program will consider development of an MOU for districts outlining roles and responsibilities.

Evidence from candidate files clearly indicates that each program implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

Standard Met with Concerns

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that there is no formalized assessment system at the unit level for evaluation and improvement. There is, however, already discussion underway on the design and implementation of such an assessment system. Planned systems are being designed to provide numerical evaluation of each candidate. A rubric for the evaluation of competence is being developed, as well as a system of candidate portfolio review by a panel of educators. When the formalized assessment system is fully operational, data will be analyzed to provide program changes and even greater support for candidates.

Although each program gathers some data, there is no evidence to suggest the existence of a unit-wide system for regularly involving program participants, program completers and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses, coaching, and measures of candidate competency that leads to substantive improvement in each credential program. Such a system has, to date, only been implemented by the Administrative Services Clear Credential Program. Previously, the Designated Subjects programs were not responsible to meet the Common Standards, but since the programs have moved into the Commission's accreditation system they will now be held to the Common Standards.

Interviews with program and institutional leadership, corroborated by program documentation, provide clear evidence that the Administrative Services Clear Credential Program's evaluation system includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications,

proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes. This is not the case with all programs. Interviews with program and institutional leadership indicate a clear commitment to integrate unit-wide assessment and evaluation into program planning, ensuring that stakeholders have the opportunity to review data and collaboratively provide suggestions for program improvement.

Standard 3: Resources

Standard Met

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that credential preparation programs are allocated adequate resources for their effective operation. Program costs are paid for through a combination of tuition, categorical funds, and application and exam fees. Because county services include a wide variety of staff development and technical assistance to ensure compliance with the Education Code and federal law, each credential program has access to an economy of scale sufficient to enable the unit to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Credential programs have become integral parts of various county services. Consequently, sufficient resources are consistently allocated to each program for program coordination and assessment management; candidate application advisement and consultation; professional development and tuition; and marketing. Moreover, faculty and staff receive ongoing training and support in current trends, initiatives and resources to ensure they receive timely and research-based information to best support the needs of their clients.

Evidence from documents corroborated by interviews with program faculty, staff, candidates, and employers indicates that sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. The partnering universities pay for Designated Subjects Instructors' salaries. While universities provide some materials for the courses, programs and instructors also make supplementary materials available. Future plans for the Designated Subjects program will include direct budget allocations for instructors. Office space is provided for full-time staff as well as for the credential analyst and administrative assistants. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs. Allocations of resources are distributed among the programs after input from stakeholders, faculty, and staff.

Standard 4: Faculty

Standard Met with Concerns

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach and supervise all courses and field experiences in each credential and certificate program. Faculty are knowledgeable in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, teaching and learning. They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution or program sponsor provides support for faculty development and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching, regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Evidence from documents corroborated by interviews with program and institutional leadership indicate that qualified persons are assigned to teach the courses and coach the administrative candidates, as well as advise candidates across programs. Interviews with current program participants and completers indicate that program faculty are student-centered, exemplify best practices, and are accommodating of student needs within the confines of a Commission-approved program. One graduate shared, “Before this program I considered myself an instructor, now I consider myself a teacher!”

Evidence from employment documents and faculty vitae corroborated by interviews with program and institutional leadership indicate that faculty are knowledgeable in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning. Moreover, they come with diverse backgrounds; have experience in varied school settings including elementary, middle, high, as well as vocational and adult settings; and have experience working with diverse socio-economic populations. Interviews with candidates, completers, program staff, and community stakeholders provide clear evidence that faculty demonstrates knowledge of cultural, ethnic and gender diversity.

Interviews with candidates, completers, program staff, and community stakeholders provide clear evidence that faculty have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Most faculty members are, in addition to their instructional role in the program, SDCOE administrators. In that capacity, they provide professional development to school personnel and direct services to P-Adult students. This allows frequent communication and collaboration among relevant stakeholders in addressing ongoing programmatic issues, as well as in planning and implementing programmatic changes.

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that faculty collaborates regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-Adult settings, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. This is corroborated by interviews with community stakeholders, i.e., District Administrators; District & SDCOE Credential Technicians; Partnering Universities; Department of Corrections Educational Staff; Non-Public Programs Educational Staff; Job Corps and Trade Unions.

Evidence from documents corroborated by interviews with program and institutional leadership indicate that the institution provides considerable support for faculty development. Moreover, interviews with candidates clearly indicate that faculty members are generally perceived as providing high-quality instruction. There is, however, little evidence that the institution evaluates the performance of instructors. Rather, instructor evaluation has been perceived to be the responsibility of the partner universities which provide courses and faculty to the unit. There are MOUs between the institution and the universities which provide a vehicle for unit evaluation of instructors. Evidence does not indicate that SDCOE administration has taken full responsibility for faculty evaluations. Unit leadership indicates that they intend to update the MOUs.

Standard 5: Admission

Standard Met

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Interviews with program leadership, faculty and staff; supporting documentation; and Interviews with candidates clearly indicate that, in each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined and publicized criteria, which meet, but in no way exceed, Commission-adopted requirements. SDCOE serves a diverse community; measures used in the admission processes encourage and support applicants from these diverse populations.

Evidence from enrollment documents, corroborated by interviews with program and institutional leadership, indicate that all admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. Interviews with local employers provide evidence that the institution's admissions process successfully identifies candidates who demonstrate a strong potential for professional accomplishment. Consequently, stakeholders report that program graduates are highly sought after for their knowledge, expertise, compassion and professionalism.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Interviews with candidates, completers, program staff, and community stakeholders provide clear evidence that candidates are generally well-advised. Advisors are knowledgeable about credential requirements, and candidates' questions and concerns are addressed in a timely and responsive manner. Program requirements are outlined for candidates in writing as part of the application process and after preliminary recommendation. Moreover, district-level credential technicians provide one-on-one advisement regarding Commission-adopted requirements.

Interviews with program staff and employers indicate that, several times each year, program staff train all district-level credential technicians in order to ensure that candidates receive accurate initial advisement. District-level credential technicians expressed uniformly high praise of the expertise and collegiality of program staff.

While some candidates report that district-level advisement lacks clarity, evidence revealed that candidates have access to advisement throughout the program and can communicate with coaches, instructors, coordinators, and county-level credential technicians at any time. Extensive information regarding programs and the complexities of Commission-adopted requirements is available at the SDCOE website.

As a result of candidate feedback, program leadership is exploring the advisability of developing: 1) program-specific candidate handbooks which outline the credentialing process; 2) a Memorandum-of-Understanding regarding district advisement; and 3) a revision of the website's Frequently Asked Questions section.

Instructors work with individual candidates who need support in meeting program requirements. On-going monitoring of goals, assignments and portfolios occurs throughout the program. Instructors give feedback throughout the program in person and via email. Candidates whose progress or performance is deemed unsatisfactory are notified, and assistance is provided to enable those candidates to succeed. Candidates may have to repeat program activities in order to demonstrate satisfactory performance. After receiving appropriate assistance, candidates whose progress or performance remains unsatisfactory are dropped from the programs. Unsuccessful candidates may lose employment and consequently fail to complete credential requirements.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**Standard Not Applicable**

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**Standard Not Applicable**

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**Standard Met**

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Evidence from interviews with candidates, instructors, coaches, and program administrators indicates that courses and activities are designed to teach the knowledge, skills, and abilities to educate and support P-Adult students in meeting state-adopted academic standards.

Evidence from the interviews and documents provided by the Program indicate that through coursework, professional development, coaching, and summative assessments, e.g., portfolios, candidates meet Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Conversations with key program leaders and documents provided by the unit show that the program is working toward a more comprehensive and systematic assessment of candidates' professional knowledge and skills.

Designated Subjects Credential Program Adult Education

Findings on Standards:

San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) collaborates with administrators from the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), National University Extension Programs (NU), San Diego State University (SDSU) and local educators to provide curriculum for adult learner candidates. The curriculum meets the Level I and Level II standards. This curriculum provides structure of teaching methodology coursework. The SDCOE Designated Subjects Adult Credential program serves more than twenty San Diego County school districts, as well as numerous small, remote, and rural educational facilities. This also includes County and Department of Correctional facilities. The visiting team found the Designated Subjects Adult Credential program to be moving forward to improve the services for candidates and the program.

The team found a comprehensive, ongoing system of program development which involves program participants and local practitioners and leads to program improvement. Qualified staff is available to provide candidates with opportunities to acquire knowledge and skills within the adult education areas. Each candidate prepares lessons that include goals and objectives.

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, it was determined that all program standards are fully met with the exception of the following three standards, which are *Met with Concerns*.

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination – Met with Concerns

Evidence from interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and program leadership corroborated by program documentation indicates that the program of personalized preparation for the Designated Subjects Adult Education credentials has an appropriate design. While the program is based on a logical rationale, it is not fully coordinated in accordance with its design. The coordination between unit staff and instructors lacks a formalized process which would allow for program improvement.

Standard 5: Faculty Evaluation and Development – Met with Concerns

While evidence indicates that university courses and instructors in the Designated Subjects Adult Education are evaluated by candidates who complete a course and instructor evaluation survey, there is no evidence that the program utilizes these data.

Standard 6: Program Development and Evaluation – Met with Concerns

Involvement in advisory and steering committee meetings provide opportunity for stakeholders to impact the quality of programs. The membership in these committees reflects the diversity from a variety of communities. The meetings are held throughout the year. Committees need program data so that members can make informed recommendations for Program improvements. There is no evidence that data generated from evaluations is analyzed, summarized, or disseminated to appropriate decision makers.

Designated Subjects Credential Program Vocational Education/Career Technical Education

Findings on Standards:

Designated Subjects Educator Preparation Program is experiencing a transition from Vocational Education to Career Technical Education. The California State Board of Education adopted the Career Technical Education (CTE) Standards in May 2005 and the CTE Framework was adopted in January 2007. The CTE Standards integrate California's rigorous academic content standards with industry-specific knowledge and skills to prepare students both for direct entry into California's industry sectors and for postsecondary education. The framework demonstrates how curricula can be integrated to provide our students with rigor and relevance in both academic and CTE knowledge and skills. These two documents brought about the development and approval of the new Career Technical Education Designated Subjects Credential Program. These standards were approved by the Commission on Accreditation on August 7, 2008. As of October 2007, each candidate's credential subject areas are chosen from the CTE's 15 sectors. Over the next four years Designated Subjects Educator Preparation Programs will be transitioning from the old Vocational Education credential requirements to the new CTE credential requirements. The Commission began issuing the Designated Subjects CTE Credentials on October 12, 2007, while ceasing the initial issuance of the Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credentials on November 1, 2007. Holders of Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credentials issued prior to November 1, 2007 may continue to renew those credentials. This transition includes the new CTC accreditation process for CTE Designated Subjects Educator Preparation Program.

San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) is actively involved in the transition from the Vocational Education to the CTE Programs. SDCOE collaborates with administrators from the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), National University Extension Programs (NU), and San Diego State University (SDSU) and with local educators to provide curriculum that meets the Level I and Level II standards. This curriculum provides a two-tiered structure of teaching methodology coursework that includes instructional components of vocational teacher education. SDCOE Designated Subjects program includes small, remote, and rural districts. The program serves more than twenty San Diego County school districts, as well as numerous outlying areas and educational facilities. Educational facilities include adult education, juvenile court schools, correctional facilities, and county jails. The visiting team found the Designated Subjects program to be moving from the Vocational Education Credential Standards to the new CTE Credential Standards.

The visiting team found an ongoing system of program development which involves program participants and local practitioners and leads to program improvement. Qualified staff is available to provide candidates opportunities to acquire teaching methodologies and skills necessary for vocational education instruction. Each candidate prepares unit plans and lesson plans that include goals, objectives, occupational safety, and candidate assessment instruments that are defined in the course syllabi.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all appropriate

program standards are met with the exception of the following three standards, each of which is ***Met with Concerns***.

Standard 1 Program Design, Rationale and Coordination – Met with Concerns

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that the program of personalized preparation for the Designated Subjects credentials has an appropriate design. While the program is based on a logical rationale, it is not coordinated in accordance with its design. The coordination between unit staff and instructors lacks a formalized process which would allow for program improvement.

Standard 5 Evaluation and Development of Instructional Personnel – Met with Concerns

Evidence from documents and interviews with faculty indicates that Designated Subjects courses are evaluated at regular intervals throughout the program by student surveys at the end of each course. The data from the surveys are not currently analyzed, summarized, and disseminated, disallowing use of the results for the development of instructional providers. Current types of data collected are inadequate to provide information for improving instruction. There is no evidence SDCOE has a process to recognize and reward outstanding teaching in the program.

Standard 6 Program Development and Evaluation – Met with Concerns

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that Advisory and Steering Committee meetings provide opportunities for all stakeholders to be involved in the program. Committees reflect the diversity of the community. Meetings are held throughout the year. However, evidence indicates that the committees lack comprehensive and ongoing data about the program's strengths and weaknesses in order to provide guidance that is based on systematic evaluations.

There is, however, already discussion underway on the design and implementation of an assessment system. Planned systems are being designed to provide numerical evaluation of each candidate. A rubric for the evaluation of competence is being developed, as well as a system of candidate portfolio review by a panel of educators. When the formalized assessment system is fully operational, data will be analyzed to provide program changes and support for candidates.

Clear Administrative Services Credential Program (Guidelines Based)

Findings:

The Clear Administrative Services Credential Program offered through the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) provides an alternative pathway for candidates to earn the Clear Credential. The Clear Administrative Services Credential Program consists of 40 hours of coaching time and 80 hours of professional development over a two-year period. The SDCOE Clear Administrative Services Credential Program reaches out to a previously underserved group of beginning administrator candidates serving in small, remote, and rural areas in the San Diego County area. Currently, there are five “in-progress” candidates and five completers.

The SDCOE Clear Administrative Services Credential Program is based on a one-on-one coaching model that encourages leadership development through authentic “on-site” experiences. The coach, who serves as the candidate’s mentor, is a highly knowledgeable retired administrator. Each coach is selected based on a history of successful experiences in K-12 schools and is matched with a candidate in an apprenticeship relationship. The coach meets and works with the candidate at the school site to guide and nurture leadership development. The coach, who is involved in continuous learning experiences with the SDCOE Coaching Cadre, applies current educational research-based strategies to the coaching process.

The SDCOE program uses the WestEd “Moving Leadership Standards into Everyday Practice” tool and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) to assess beginning competency and on-going development of each candidate’s progress toward proficiency of the CPSELs. Each candidate’s plan is monitored by the SDCOE program sponsor in collaboration with the candidate’s assigned coach. Three CPSEL standards are addressed in the coaching/professional development plan each year and assessed through continuous dialogue, coaching logs and candidate reflections. Evidence of the candidate’s proficiency is measured through their culminating project portfolios at the end of the two-year period. Each candidate presents the portfolio to the program sponsor and to the coach. The SDCOE program sponsor is responsible for verifying that the candidate meets the criteria to obtain the Clear Administrative Services Credential. The program is evaluated through candidate surveys. The data collected from the surveys guide the continuous improvement of the over-all program.

After thorough review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, corroborated by interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and program administrators, the team determined that all program guidelines are **Met**. Throughout the interview process, the candidates indicated high satisfaction with the school-site coaching/professional development focus of the program. There was consensus among candidates, completers, and coaches in the program that the site-based approach created authentic and, therefore, more appropriate contexts for learning administrative skills and leadership competencies.